

Remarks/Arguments

In the December 15, 2006 office action, claims 18-19, 21-22 and 23 were rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ehn, Jr. et al (US Patent 4,924,663) in view of Ternes et al (US Patent 3,378,297).

In the March 19, 2007 notice of non-compliant amendment, it was indicated that the listing of claims did not include the text of all pending claims.

Claim 18 is amended to specify the lower lip of the molded plastic grass catcher touches the reel-type mower, and the plurality of retaining structures integrally molded into the lower lip grip the reinforcing rod in place. Claim 18 is patentable over Ehn, Jr. et al and Ternes et al. Ehn, Jr. et al relates to a grass catcher, but lacks a reinforcing rod gripped by retaining structures integrally molded into the lower lip.

Ternes et al does not relate to a molded plastic grass catcher, but relates to a safety visor hinge. Ternes et al fails to show retaining structures integrally molded into the lower lip of a one-piece molded plastic grass catcher that grips a reinforcing rod in place. Instead of integrally molded retaining structures, Ternes et al shows hinge means 10 formed from a single sheet of metal material. Instead of gripping a reinforcing rod in place, Ternes et al's hinge section 20 would allow the safety visor to pivot on rod means 12.

Claim 19 is patentable over Ehn, Jr. et al and Ternes et al for the same reasons as claim 18 on which it depends. Additionally, Ehn, Jr. et al and Ternes et al fail to disclose integral retaining structures having substantially the same thickness as the walls. Ehn, Jr. et al lacks any integral retaining structures. Ternes et al's hinge means 10 is sheet metal that is not integral with visor material 18, nor does it have substantially the same thickness.

Claims 21 and 22 are patentable over Ehn, Jr. et al and Ternes et al for at least the same reasons as claim 18 on which they depend.

Claim 23 is patentable over Ehn, Jr. et al and Ternes et al for at least the same reasons as claim 18 on which it depends, and because the cited references fail to disclose a contoured bottom surface portion dimensioned to fit over the roller without interfering with roller movement. Ehn, Jr. et al's Fig. 5 shows bottom 34 and front lip or shelf portion 37 with ribs 41 for strength reinforcement, but fails to show a contoured bottom portion dimensioned to fit over a roller without interfering with roller

movement.

In conclusion, it is believed that claims 18-19 and 21-23 are in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Any fees or charges due as a result of filing of the present paper may be charged against Deposit Account 04-0525. Two duplicates of this page are enclosed.

Respectfully,

/SDellett, Reg.# 32,564/
Stephen D. Dellett
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Stephen D. Dellett
Reg. No. 32,564
Patent Department
Deere & Company
One John Deere Place
Moline, IL 61265
Telephone No. (309) 765-4232